



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,324	09/28/2001	Michael S. Hildreth	43702-251979	3168

7590 07/15/2003

Paul E. Knowlton, Esq.  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
Suite 2800  
1100 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, GA 30309-4530

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

COMSTOCK, DAVID C

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3732

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N.K.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/966,324	HILDRETH, MICHAEL S.
	Examiner David C. Comstock	Art Unit 3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hildreth (4,327,754; cited by Applicant) in view of Hanson (4,993,441).

Hildreth discloses a hair treatment device A comprising a supporting hair roller C, a base implement D including a first and second end having a cradle 41 and a broad cut-out shoulder opposite the cradle. A support rod 31 connects the first and second end. The support rod 31 also includes a support arm 20. Hildreth discloses the claimed invention except that the roller includes protrusions instead of notches. Hanson shows that notches are an equivalent structure known in the art (see Figs. 2-10). Therefore, because these two structures for roller engagement were art-recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute notches for protrusions. Furthermore, it is old and well-known in the art to provide a hair roller with a compressible or malleable body such as foam (see, for example, Maznik (5,263,501), col. 6, lines 66-68). Hildreth also disclose a method of using the device comprising wrapping hair around rollers, placing the rollers in cradles in the first and second ends, applying solutions to the hair, and removing the hair from the rollers; therefore, the method including the notches and compressible or malleable

roller body is inherent in the device as set forth above (see col. 3, line 49 - col. 4, line 33). With regard to claims 10 and 11, it is old and well-known in the art to apply heat during a permanent and to rinse the hair after the permanent is complete (see, for example, Losenno (4,911,185) (disclosing a method of performing a permanent including heating and rinsing).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 21 April 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that Maznik is not expandable, it is noted that the coil spring of Maznik is subject to physical laws of heat expansion and therefore, must expand when heated. Consequently, it would apply pressure to hair wrapped around its foam outer covering. Furthermore, hair would naturally "settle into" the malleable, i.e. capable of being deformed, foam as the coil spring unavoidable expands under heat. As noted in the rejection, it is not new to use a coil/foam curler design. The noted quality of expansion, as claimed, while perhaps useful, is inherent in any such common curler design.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Comstock whose telephone number is (703) 308-8514.



D.C. Comstock  
11 July 2003



EDUARDO C. ROBERT  
PATENT EXAMINER